

REMARKS

Claims 9, 15, 24, 27, and 28 have been amended, claims 23 and 26 have been canceled, and claim 29 has been added. Thus, claims 9-11, 13-22, 24, 25, 27, 28 and 29 remain pending in the case. Further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application is hereby respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 24-28 were objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response thereto, all limitations of allowed claim 26 and intervening claim 23 have been incorporated into independent claim 15. A similar limitation has been incorporated into independent claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent claims 9 and 15, as well as claims dependent therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

Section 102 & 103 Rejections

Claims 9, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,657,330 to Matsumoto (hereinafter "Matsumoto"). In addition, several of the dependent claims (13, 14 and 18-22) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,983,017 to Kemp et al. (hereinafter "Kemp").

As noted above, independent claims 9 and 15 have been amended to include subject matter deemed in the Office Action as allowable. In particular, independent claim 15 has been amended to contain the allowable subject matter recited in claim 26 (and intervening claim 23): "wherein the state restoration logic comprises a multiplexer, which is coupled to the state machine for receiving a current state of the state machine, and coupled to the backup register for receiving the preceding state of the state machine" and "wherein the multiplexer selects the preceding state of the state machine for output when a control signal received by the multiplexer indicates an invalid trigger event." A similar limitation, which captures the above-mentioned functionality of the multiplexer, has been incorporated into independent claim 9.

Applicants agree that the cited art fails to teach the various features set out in amended independent claims 9 and 15. As described on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims containing allowable subject matter (such as amended independent claims 9 and 15)

would be allowed. No amendments were made to the claims which would warrant further examination or search since the subject matter of the dependent claims which have been inserted into the present independent claims have already been examined.

Patentability of Added Claims

The present amendment adds dependent claim 29. Support for the added limitations may be found in previously presented claim 24 and in the present specification on page 17, lines 4-26. Since claim 29 is dependent on claim 9, claim 29 is considered to be patentably distinct for at least the same reasons set forth above for the patentability of claim 9. Accordingly, approval of added claim 29 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

This response constitutes a complete response to all issues raised in the Office Action mailed June 27, 2005. In view of the remarks traversing the rejections, Applicants assert that pending claims 9-11, 13-22, 24, 25, 27, 28 and 29 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, comments, or suggestions, the undersigned earnestly requests a telephone conference.

No fees are required for filing this amendment; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to LSI Logic Corp. Deposit Account No. 12-2252.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin L. Daffer
Reg. No. 34,146
Agent for Applicant(s)

Daffer McDaniel, LLP
P.O. Box 684908
Austin, TX 78768-4908
Ph: (512) 476-1400
Date: September 27, 2005
JMF